arXiv:1409.8593v3 [cs.NA] 9 Feb 2016

# Robust solutions of uncertain mixed-integer linear programs using decomposition techniques

R. Mínguez[a,*], V. Casero-Alonso[b]

[a] *Independent consultant, C/Honduras 1, 13160, Torralba de Calatrava, Ciudad Real, Spain*

[b] *Department of Mathematics, Institute of Mathematics Applied to Science and Engineering, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain*

**Abstract**

Robust optimization is a framework for modeling optimization problems involving data uncertainty and during the last decades has been an area of active research. If we focus on linear programming (LP) problems with i) uncertain data, ii) binary decisions and iii) hard constraints within an ellipsoidal uncertainty set, this paper provides a different interpretation of their robust counterpart (RC) inspired from decomposition techniques. This new interpretation allows the proposal of an ad-hoc decomposition technique to solve the RC problem with the following advantages: i) it improves tractability, specially for large-scale problems, and ii) it provides exact bounds for the probability of constraint violation in case the probability distribution of uncertain parameters are completely defined by using first and second-order probability moments. An attractive aspect of our method is that it decomposes the second-order cone programming problem, associated with the robust counterpart, into a linear master problem and different quadratically constrained problems (QCP) of considerable lower size. The optimal solution is achieved through the solution of these master and subproblems within an iterative scheme based on outer approximations of the second-order cone constraints.

*Keywords:* Stochastic programming, Conic programming and interior point methods, Decision analysis under uncertainty, Reliability analysis, Robust optimization

*Corresponding author: rominsol@gmail.com, tlfn.: 00 34 926810046

## 1. Introduction

The concept of robust optimization was developed to drop the classical assumption in mathematical programming that the input data is precisely known and equal to given nominal values. It is well known that in practice, most of the data involved in optimization problems is uncertain, and optimal solutions using nominal values might no longer be optimal or even feasible. Robust optimization techniques deal with the problem of designing solutions that are immune to data uncertainty [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] by solving equivalent deterministic problems. The main advantage of these techniques is that it is not required to know the probability density function (PDF) of the uncertain data. The decision-maker searches for the optimal solution of all-possible realizations of uncertain data within the uncertainty set, and in addition, probabilistic bounds of constraint violation valid for different probability density functions are available.

Stochastic programming is also a framework for modelling problems that involve uncertainty [8]. In this particular case, uncertain data is assumed to follow a given probability distribution and are usually dealt with by using scenario models or finite sampling from the PDFs [9, 10]. However, the number of scenarios needed to represent the actual stochastic processes can be very large, which may result in intractable problems. That is the most important reason why robust optimization is gaining popularity among practitioners with respect to stochastic programming [11], not only in the operational research community but also for design engineers [12, 13].

Stochastic programming in the context of engineering design and optimization, i.e. reliability-based structural optimization [14, 15, 16, 17, 18], has also broadened using as risk measure the failure probability. In this context, it is required to know: i) the joint probability density function of all random variables involved and ii) a method for calculating the probabilities of failure for a given design. Since the evaluation of failure probabilities is not an easy task, different methods have been developed, such as First-Order Second Moment (FOSM, [19]).

Despite the analogies among the problems treated within these different frameworks, i.e. stochastic programming, robust optimization, and reliability-based structural optimization, research trends and solution techniques have followed different paths. To the best of our knowledge, a few works have taken advantage of methods from one field to be applied to any other. For instance, [20] proposes a new method to solve certain classes of stochastic

programming problems based on FOSM and mathematical programming decomposition techniques. Their method focus on a specific type of problems where: i) the joint probability distribution of the random variables involved is given or can be estimated parametrically, ii) distributions do not depend on the decision variables, and iii) the random variables only affect the objective function. Recently, [21] proposed a new risk measure, the buffered failure probability, which allows the generalization of the CVaR concept from stochastic programming [9, 10] to reliability-based structural optimization problems using finite sampling. One of the aims of the present work is to give a new perspective and apply concepts originating from structural reliability to robust optimization, we attempt to shed new light on existing problems and as such stir innovative thinking.

In particular, we focus on the type of problems dealt with on work [5], i.e. linear mathematical programming problems with hard constraints that must be satisfied for any possible realization of the uncertain data. [5] proposes to obtain robust solutions of an uncertain LP problem with ellipsoidal uncertainty sets, whose RC results is a conic quadratic problem, i.e. a convex and tractable problem that can be solved in polynomial time by interior point algorithms. However, the inclusion of binary and/or integer decisions poses new challenges from the computational perspective, which resulted in the proposal of an alternative uncertainty set that transforms the RC into a lineal formulation solvable using standard branch-and-cut solvers [7]. This paper proposes an alternative and decomposable solution technique inspired in the outer approximation method proposed by [22], which allows reaching the optimal solution of the RC problem by solving two kind of problems within an iterative scheme: one mixed-integer linear master problem, and one subproblem of considerable lower size for each hard constraint. This strategy of decomposing a problem into smaller pieces has proved to be effective to improve tractability in many different applications [23, 24].

The proposed method has the following feature which makes it attractive for practical use: it improves tractability with respect to interior point algorithms when binary and/or integer decision variables are included, specially for large-scale problems, because i) the master problem remains linear and ii) the subproblems are QCP with just one quadratic constraint, which have analytical solutions. In addition and due to the relationship between the subproblem formulation and reliability-based structural techniques (FOSM), it allows to calculate exact bounds for the probability of constraint violation in case the probability distributions of uncertain parameters are com-

pletely defined by using first and second-orden moments (mean and variance-covariance). This feature could encourage engineers used to working with failure probabilities to take advantage of robust optimization techniques, even without using the proposed iterative method. Finally, the method proposed in this paper constitutes an alternative formulation to that proposed by [7] using cardinality constrained uncertainty sets. Both approaches solve mixed-integer linear programming problems, the main difference is that the method proposed by [7] requires the definition of the maximum number of parameters allowed to reach its worst possible values, while the approach proposed in this paper requires the definition of the protection level. Besides, the proposed method would not require the definition of bounds for the uncertain parameters, which might be of interest for certain applications.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the robust formulation of linear programming problems. In Section 3 a detailed description of the decomposition method proposed in this work is given, while in section 4 the relationship with FOSM technique is explained in detail, paying special attention to its relationship with ellipsoidal uncertainty sets. In Sections 5 and 6 an illustrative example and a realistic case study are respectively described, solved, analyzed, and compared with existing approaches. Finally, in Section 7 some relevant conclusions are duly drawn.

## 2. Robust counterpart of an uncertain mixed-integer linear programming problem

Consider the following problem:

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{x}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \boldsymbol{c}^T\boldsymbol{x} \ , \tag{1}$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} &\leq \boldsymbol{0} && (2)\\ \boldsymbol{l} \leq \boldsymbol{x} &\leq \boldsymbol{u} && (3)\\ x_j &\in \mathcal{Z};\ j = 1, \ldots, k;\ k > 0;\ k \leq n, && (4) \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}$ is the decision variable vector of $n$ variables, the first $k$ of which are integral. Note that we consider that $k > 0$, i.e. it always contains binary and/or integer decisions, otherwise the problem can be solved efficiently using interior point algorithms. $\boldsymbol{c}(n \times 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{A}(m \times n)$ are data coefficients, and

$\boldsymbol{l}(n \times 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}(n \times 1)$ are lower and upper decision variable bounds. We assume without loss of generality that the only uncertain coefficients are those belonging to matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(m \times n)$. For those cases where vector $\boldsymbol{c}(n \times 1)$ is uncertain, or even the right hand side of equation (2) is uncertain and equal to $\boldsymbol{b}(m \times 1)$, it is possible to rewrite the original problem as (1)-(4) (see [25]).

The RC of problem (1)-(4) is the same problem but replacing constraint set (2) by:

$$\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{0};\ \forall \boldsymbol{A} \in \boldsymbol{U} \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{U}$ is an uncertainty set. According to [25] (check also reference [12]), an LP with a certain objective is a constraint-wise problem and its solution does not change if the uncertainty set is extended to the product of its projections on the subspaces of the constrains, i.e. constraint set (5) is equivalent to:

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} \leq 0;\ \forall \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} \in U_i, i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T}; i = 1, \ldots, m$ corresponds to the rows of matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $U_i$ is the projection of $\boldsymbol{U}$ on the subspace of the data of $\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}$.

Traditionally, parameter uncertainty $a_{ij} \in \boldsymbol{A}$ within robust optimization is modeled as a symmetric and bounded random variable $\tilde{a}_{ij}$ [5] that takes values in the interval $[a_{ij} - \delta_{ij}, a_{ij} + \delta_{ij}]$ following an unknown probability distribution. Elements $a_{ij} \in \boldsymbol{A}$ represent nominal values and $\delta_{ij}; i = 1, \ldots, m; j = 1, \ldots, n$ are the maximum absolute value deviations from the nominal values. This interval characterization of parameter uncertainty is required if worst-case oriented methods, or box uncertainty sets are used. This is the solution proposed by [1], where each uncertain parameter $\tilde{a}_{ij}; i = 1, \ldots, m; j = 1, \ldots, n$ takes its worst possible value within the given interval. This strategy leads to an excessively conservative solution.

To address this excessive conservatism, [5] proposes an alternative uncertainty set. Let us assume that uncertain parameter vectors $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}; i = 1, \ldots, m$ have nominal or expected values $\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}; i = 1, \ldots, m$ and variance-covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}; i = 1, \ldots, m$ which is positive definite, respectively. According to [5], the ellipsoidal uncertainty set can be written using the Mahalanobis distance as follows:

$$U_i(\beta_i) \equiv \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} | \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}\right)^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}\right) \leq \beta_i^2 \right\};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{7}$$

so that the RC of problem (1)-(4) is the same problem but replacing constraint set (2) by:

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Maximum} \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} \end{array} \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} \right) \leq 0;\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} \in U_i(\beta_i), i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{8}$$

where parameters $\beta_i;\ i = 1, \ldots, m$ control the size and protection level of the ellipsoidal sets for each constraint. According to [5], for given values of the decision variables $\boldsymbol{x}$, the probability that each uncertain constraint is violated is given by the following expression:

$$\text{Prob}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} > 0\right) \leq e^{-\beta_i^2/2}, i = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{9}$$

Note that contrary to the worst case approach proposed by [1], only first and second order moments of the random parameters without lower and upper bounds are considered in this paper for the ellipsoidal uncertainty set. Ther reason is that in case the uncertain parameters follow a multivariate normal distribution, the probability bound (9) can be replaced by the exact probability, which might be of interest for practitioners. Robust optimization approaches involving first and/or second-order moment information has been studied by quite a few researchers (see for example [26] and the recent comprehensive survey [27] for more references).

In order to solve constraints (8), the uncertainty sets (7) are transformed using an affine mapping into balls of radius $\beta_i; i = 1, \ldots, m$, respectively, resulting in the following set of alternative constraints:

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Maximum} \\ \boldsymbol{z}^{(i)} \end{array} \quad \left(\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}\right) \boldsymbol{x} \right) \leq 0;\ \|\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}\| \leq \beta_i, i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{L}^{(i)}$ is the mapping matrix which can be obtained from Cholesky decomposition of variance-covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)^T}$, $\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}$ represents a perturbation vector and $\|\cdot\|$ stands for Euclidean norm. The analytical solution of constraints (10) in terms of the objective function is (see [5]):

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} + \beta_i \|\boldsymbol{L}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}\| \leq 0; i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{11}$$

or equivalently,

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} + \beta_i \sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}} \leq 0; i = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{12}$$

Finally, the RC of problem (1)-(4) using ellipsoidal uncertainty sets becomes:

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{x}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \boldsymbol{c}^T\boldsymbol{x} \ , \tag{13}$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} + \beta_i\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{x}} &\leq 0; i = 1, \ldots, m, && (14)\\ \boldsymbol{l} \leq \boldsymbol{x} &\leq \boldsymbol{u} && (15)\\ x_j &\in \mathcal{Z};\ \forall j \leq k;\ k > 0;\ k \leq n. && (16) \end{aligned}$$

Problem (13)-(16) is a mixed-integer conic quadratic problem, i.e a nonlinear formulation, and as pointed out by [7], it is not particularly attractive for solving robust linear discrete optimization models. Note that [7] proposed an alternative linear RC problem to avoid (13)-(16) formulation when binary and/or integer variables are involved ($k > 0$), which instead of allowing all random parameters to take their worst possible values within the given intervals such as [1], only allows a pre-established number of parameters $\Gamma$ to reach them. This alternative formulation remains linear, and it also provides a robust solution in terms of probability of infeasibility.

## 3. Decomposition method for the RC

This paper provides a methodology to solve problem (13)-(16) using mathematical programming decomposition techniques. Let assume $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu; \nu = 1, \ldots, \infty$ being different values of the design variables $\boldsymbol{x}$, thus the mentioned problem can be rewritten equivalently as follows:

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{x}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \boldsymbol{c}^T\boldsymbol{x} \ , \tag{17}$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_\nu^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} &\leq 0;\ i = 1, \ldots, m;\ \nu = 1, \ldots, \infty, && (18)\\ \boldsymbol{l} \leq \boldsymbol{x} &\leq \boldsymbol{u} && (19)\\ x_j &\in \mathcal{Z};\ \forall j \leq k;\ k > 0;\ k \leq n, && (20) \end{aligned}$$

where column-vectors $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_\nu^{(i)} = (\hat{a}_{i1_\nu}, \ldots, \hat{a}_{ij_\nu}, \ldots, \hat{a}_{in_\nu})^T; i = 1, \ldots, m$ for constraint $\nu$ correspond, respectively, to the solution of the following optimiza-

tion problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\nu}^{(i)} = & \arg\max_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}} \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}_{\nu} \ , \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}\right)^T \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}\right)^{-1} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}\right) \leq \beta_i^2 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Note that constraint (18) constitute a linear envelope of the original convex constraints (14) composed by infinite hyperplanes, which makes problems (13)-(16) and (17)-(21) to be equivalents, as shown in Theorem 3.2. However, in this second alternative the values of $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\nu}^{(i)}$ are used explicitly in (18) to define tangent hyperplanes with respect to the original convex conic restrictions (see Remark 3.2).

The question is: how to define efficiently those possible solutions $\boldsymbol{x}_{\nu}$ in order to construct cuts (18) without the need to include an unlimited number of constraints? To answer this question, we propose decomposing the original problem into two procedures:

1. **Decision making at iteration $l$:** For given values of $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\nu}^{(i)}$; $i = 1, \ldots, m$; $\nu = 0, ..., l-1$, the decision variables maximizing the problem (17)-(20) are obtained, i.e. $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_l$. This is considered the *master problem*. Due to the convex character of conic constraints, the master problem is a relaxation of the original problem because the feasible region defined by the linear envelope always contain the feasible region defined by the original conic restrictions (see Remark 3.3). Note that the master problem solution constitutes an upper bound of the optimal solution.
2. **Construct additional tangent hyperplanes:** For the decisions $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}_l$ made in the previous step, update the values of the random variables $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)}$ required to achieve the target security criterium given by $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m)^T$, which is equivalent to construct additional tangent hyperplanes with respect to the original conic constraints. These are considered the *subproblems*.

Thus, the solution of the alternative problem (17)-(21) is achieved by means of an iterative scheme, which is repeated until all the original conic constraints are satisfied or the values of the decision variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ stabilize. The main reasons for proposing this decomposition are:

1. Problem (17)-(20) for given values of the parameter values $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\nu}^{(i)}$ is a mixed-integer linear mathematical programming problem, which can be solved efficiently using state-of-the-art mixed-integer solvers.

**Remark 3.1.** *Theoretically, the conical convex constraints (14) can be reproduced with an infinite number of tangent hyperplanes as described in (18). However, the iterative process above converges to the optimal solution by using a finite number of hyperplanes (Theorem 3.2).*

2. Problems (21) for given values of the decision variables ($\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$) can be solved for each constraint independently. Each of these problems is a QCP problem with just one quadratic constraint [28], which assuming that only the first two moments of the probability distributions are used, it has an analytical solution as shown below.

**Theorem 3.1 (Analytical solution of subproblem (21)).** *The analytical optimal solutions of subproblems (21) at iteration $l$, in terms of the uncertain coefficients, corresponds to:*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} + \beta_i \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}_l}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}_l}};\ i = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{22}$$

**Proof of Theorem 3.1 (Analytical solution of subproblem (21)).** *It is straightforward to prove that (22) is the optimal solution of problem (21) by just evaluating its objective function at this point, i.e.:*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}_l &= \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}_l + \beta_i \frac{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}_l}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}_l}};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \\ &= \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}_l + \beta_i \sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}_l};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

*which is exactly the same optimal objective function as that given by expression (12). This completes the proof.*

**Remark 3.2.** *Note that parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)}$ in (22) are the derivatives of the conic constraints given by (23) at $\boldsymbol{x}_l$, which explains why constraints (18) correspond to tangent hyperplanes with respect to the conic restrictions.*

**Theorem 3.2.** *Problems (13)-(16) and (17)-(21) are equivalents.*

**Proof of Theorem 3.2.** *We prove that the optimal solution of both problems are the same. On the one hand, if (13)-(16) is feasible, then its optimal*

*solution $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$ is the optimal solution of (17)-(21). Let us prove it by contradiction. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{x}' \neq \boldsymbol{x}^\star$ is the optimal solution of (17)-(21). This vector satisfies constraints (18)-(20), specifically*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}' \leq 0;\ i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

*which, using (22), correspond to*

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x}' + \beta_i \sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}'^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{x}'} \leq 0;\ i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

*i.e. they are equal to constraints (12) or (14). Thus, vector $\boldsymbol{x}'$ satisfies constraints (14)-(16) and it holds the following condition $\boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}' > \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}^\star$ because problem (17)-(21) is a relaxation of the original problem (13)-(16), which contradicts the optimality of $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$.*

*On the other hand, it is shown that the proposed method always terminates at a solution of (13)-(16). Again, let $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$ be the optimal solution of (13)-(16). Since (17)-(21) is a relaxation of (13)-(16), $\boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}^\star$ is a lower bound with respect to the optimal value of (17)-(21), which is attained at $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$. Now assume that the algorithm terminates with an indicated solution $\boldsymbol{x}'$ with $\boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}' < \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}^\star$ (i.e. not optimal), however, $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$ must be feasible in the previous step, which contradicts the assumption that the algorithm terminates at $\boldsymbol{x}'$. This concludes the proof.*

The proposed iterative scheme to solve (17)-(21) is described below:

**Algorithm 3.1.** *Decomposition method*

*Step 0* ***Problem definition:*** *Selection of protection levels $\beta_i; \forall i$, objective function, constraints, the mean and variance-covariance matrix of the involved random parameters $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}; \forall i$ and the tolerance of the process $\varepsilon$. Set $\nu = 0$ and the initial values of the random parameters to their expected or nominal values $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_0^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}; \forall i$.*

*Step 1* ***Solving the master problem:*** *Update the iteration counter $\nu \longrightarrow \nu + 1$ and calculate the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$ of the following master problem:*

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{x}}{Maximize} \quad \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x}\ , \tag{24}$$

*subject to*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_l^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} &\leq 0;\ i=1,\ldots,m;\ l<\nu && (25)\\ \boldsymbol{l}\leq\boldsymbol{x} &\leq \boldsymbol{u}, && (26)\\ x_j &\in \mathcal{Z};\ \forall j\leq k;\ k>0;\ k\leq n. && (27)\end{aligned}$$

*Continue in* **Step 2**.

*Step 2* ***Stopping rule:*** *Check if the current solution $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$ satisfies the original conic restrictions (14). If it does, the optimal solution has been found. If it does not but $\nu>1$ and $||\boldsymbol{x}_\nu-\boldsymbol{x}_{\nu-1}||<\varepsilon$, stop the process with $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$ as optimal solution, otherwise continue to* **Step 3**.

*Step 3* ***Solving subproblems:*** *Plug solution $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$ obtained in* **Step 1** *in (22) to obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_\nu^{(i)}$ and continue in* **Step 1**.

We iteratively repeat Steps from 1 to 3, until the optimal solution is achieved or the norm associated with design variables $||\boldsymbol{x}_\nu||$ does not change significantly (less than the tolerance $\varepsilon$) between consecutive iterations $\nu$ and $\nu-1$.

**Remark 3.3.** *Theoretically, constraints (25) contain the hyperplanes associated with all rows of matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, i.e. $m$ tangent hiperplanes for each iteration. However, in practice, only the hyperplane approximations related to infeasible conic restrictions at the current solution point $\boldsymbol{x}_\nu$ are required to achieve convergence, i.e. tangent hyperplanes related to $i\in\{1,2,\ldots,m\}$ that satisfies condition*

$$\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x}_\nu+\beta_i\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_\nu^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{x}_\nu}>0,$$

*are used.*

Let us remark the reader that the non-linearities in formulation (13)-(16) do not make this problem particularly attractive for solving robust discrete optimization models, however, the proposed decomposition remove those non-linearities from the master problem, which can be solved efficiently using standard mixed-integer linear programming algorithms.

Based on the ideas of the outer approximation algorithm ([29], [22]). The convergence characteristics of this iterative method are discussed in the next Theorem.

**Theorem 3.3.** *The Algorithm 3.1 terminates in a finite number of steps.*

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** *We prove that no solution is generated twice by the iterative process. At iteration $l$, the solution $\boldsymbol{x}_l$ for the master problem (17)-(20) is obtained. If it is not the optimal solution, at least one of the original conic constraints (14) is not satisfied, for instance $\boldsymbol{a}^{(j)^T}\boldsymbol{x}_l + \beta_j\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(j)}\boldsymbol{x}_l} > 0$ for some $j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$. Then, the corresponding tangent hyperplane $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{l+1}^{(j)^T}\boldsymbol{x} \leq 0$ is added for the next master problem, and since it was infeasible at iteration $l$ because $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{l+1}^{(j)^T}\boldsymbol{x}_l = \boldsymbol{a}^{(j)^T}\boldsymbol{x}_l + \beta_j\sqrt{\boldsymbol{x}_l^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(j)}\boldsymbol{x}_l} > 0$, the next solution of the master problem $\boldsymbol{x}_{l+1}$ must be different so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_{l+1}^{(j)^T}\boldsymbol{x}_{l+1} \leq 0$.*

*Then, the finiteness of Algorithm 3.1 follows from the previous property and from:*

1. *The finiteness of the feasible region if all variables are integral.*
2. *The stopping rule in case continuous variables are present, which ends the iterative process when the norm associated with decision variables between two consecutive iterations changes less than the tolerance $\varepsilon$ or all conic constraints are feasible.*

**Remark 3.4.** *If all the variables considered are binary or integers, i.e. $x_i \in \mathcal{Z};\ i = 1,\ldots,n$ or equivalently $k = n$, the finiteness of Algorithm 3.1 follows from the finiteness of those variables, that are bounded, and the property that no integer solution is generated twice by the algorithm. Note that assuming that the original problem is feasible, and if all the decision variables are binary/integer, the feasible region is a finite set (although it could be extremely large), so if our algorithm improves the solution between iterations and the number of solutions is finite, the algorithm would stop in a number of finite steps (which could also be extremely high).*

**Remark 3.5.** *We have not prove the convergence rate, however numerical simulations with different physically based problems indicate that convergence is very fast. Note that we use the same arguments than those used in the paper by Fletcher and Leyffer [22] to prove the convergence of solving mixed integer nonlinear programs by outer approximation, because our algorithm constitutes an outer approximation.*

## 4. Relationship with First-Order-Second-Moment (FOSM) methods

Structural reliability has been an area of active research during the last decades [see 30, 19, 31, 32, 33, 15, 34]. It primarily focuses on the quantifica-

tion and evaluation of the safety of structures considering that the variables involved are uncertain. Assuming that constraints (6) represent limit-state equations, the random variables involved in each constraint $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}$ belong to an $n$-dimensional space, which for given values of the decision variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be divided into two regions with respect to the limit-state equation $g(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}})$, the *feasible* ($\mathcal{F}$) and the *unfeasible* ($\mathcal{U}$) regions. That is,

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathcal{F}_i \equiv \{(\tilde{a}_{i,1}, \tilde{a}_{i,2}, \ldots, \tilde{a}_{i,n})\} | g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) = \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} \leq 0\};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \\ \mathcal{U}_i \equiv \{(\tilde{a}_{i,1}, \tilde{a}_{i,2}, \ldots, \tilde{a}_{i,n})\} | g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) = \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)^T} \boldsymbol{x} > 0\};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \end{array} \tag{28}$$

where the feasible regions $\mathcal{F}_i$ corresponds to feasible realizations of the uncertain parameters associated with constraint $i$, and the unfeasible regions $\mathcal{U}_i$ to unfeasible realizations of the uncertain parameters related to constraint $i$. Structural reliability methods focus on the quantification of the probability of random variables associated with the limit-state equations $g_i; \forall i$ to be in the unfeasible region, also called the failure probability. The final aim is the selection of the appropriate decision variables so that this probability of failure is below a given threshold $\alpha$.

The probabilities of failure or infeasibility can be calculated using the joint probability distribution functions of all random variables involved, by means of the following multidimensional integral over the unfeasible regions $\mathcal{U}_i$:

$$\text{Prob}(g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) > 0) = \int\limits_{g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) > 0} f(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) da_{i1} da_{i2} \ldots da_{in};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{29}$$

where $f(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)})$ is the joint probability density function of the random parameters involved, which assuming that only expectations $\boldsymbol{a}^{(i)}; \forall i$ and variance-covariances $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)}; \forall i$ are being used, it corresponds to a multivariate normal distribution. This is a requirement to use FOSM methods, although alternative multivariate probability distribution models could be used instead (FORM).

To perform the integration required in (29), the dependent normally distributed random variables $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}$ can be transformed into independent standard normal random variables $\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}$ that can be integrated straightforwardly. Using the linear Hasofer and Lind transformation [19], the relationships between both set of variables are:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)} \boldsymbol{z}^{(i)};\ i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{30}$$

where $\boldsymbol{L}^{(i)}$ is the Cholesky factorization of the variance-covariance matrix, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{L}^{(i)^T}$. This factorization is always possible for positive definite matrices, and variance-covariance matrices must be positive definite by definition because their eigenvalues represent variances which must be always positive. Transformation (30) is equivalent to the mapping transformation in (10). Finally, (29) can be evaluated by solving the following optimization problem for each constraint:

$$\left.\begin{array}{lcl} \beta_i & = & \underset{\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{(i)^2}}\ , \\ \text{subject to} & & \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} & = & \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}, \\ g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) & = & \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} = 0 \end{array}\right\} i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{31}$$

where the optimal solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}^{(i)}$ corresponds to the closest point to the origin located on the limit-state equation in the standard and independent normal random space, $\beta_i$ is the minimum distance so-called *reliability index* in the structural reliability scientific community, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^*}$ is the *point of maximum likelihood*, i.e. the actual values of the uncertain parameters located on the limit of the feasibility region where the probability is higher, and it represents the most likely values of the random parameters that produce infeasibility. Note that the reliability index $\beta_i$ is an non-negative value for probabilities of failure/infeasibility lower than 0.5, which is the case for the robust application considered in this paper. The final probability of infeasibility (29) is related to the reliability index by the relation

$$\text{Prob}(g_i(\boldsymbol{x}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}) > 0) = \Phi(-\beta_i); \forall i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{32}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal random variables. This method provides the exact probability if the limit-state equation is linear in the standard normal random space, i.e., if the resulting limit-state distribution is normally distributed, which is the case if uncertain parameters are normally distributed.

In Figure 1, a 2-D graphical interpretation of the FOSM method is shown. In the independent standard normal random space $\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}$, the joint probability distribution function contours are $n$-spheres centered at the origin, which in the figure becomes concentric circumferences at the origin such that the further the point $(z_1^{(i)}, z_2^{(i)})$ is away from the origin, the lower the value of the

joint probability distribution function. The solution of problem (31) provides the closest point to the origin in the limit-state equation. This limit-state equation is linear whenever the random variables are normally distributed.

An important aspect with respect to problems in (31) is that, at the optimum, i.e. $\hat{\beta}_i$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}^{(i)}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}$, they are equivalent to the following problems:

$$\left.\begin{array}{lll} & \underset{\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}}{\text{Maximize}} & \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)^T}\boldsymbol{x} \ , \\ \text{subject to} & & \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)} & = & \boldsymbol{a}^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{L}^{(i)}\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}, \\ \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{(i)^2}} & \leq & \hat{\beta}_i \end{array}\right\} i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{33}$$

because they have equivalent KKT conditions [35]. Proof of this statement can be found in [20]. Besides, these problems (33) are the same as problems in (21). Decomposable methods for reliability-based and stochastic problems, such as [34] and [20] inspired us to propose this decomposition solution method.

## 5. Illustrative example

In order to illustrate the proposed method and the graphical interpretation of the iterative process, a simple example with only two decision variables is presented below.

Let consider the following problem:

$$\underset{x_1, x_2}{\text{Maximize}} \quad c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 \ , \tag{34}$$

subject to

$$a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 \leq b_1, \tag{35}$$

$$a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 \leq b_2, \tag{36}$$

$$x_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\};\ i = 1, 2, \tag{37}$$

where $\boldsymbol{c} = (3\ 3)^T$, $\boldsymbol{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\mathbf{b} = (7\ 7)^T$. The only uncertain parameters are those of matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ so that their expected values are equal

to their nominal values and the variance-covariance matrix associated with each constraint (35) and (36) are, respectively:

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1^2 & 0.016 \\ 0.016 & 0.2^2 \end{pmatrix};\ \mathbf{\Sigma}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.2^2 & -0.01 \\ -0.01 & 0.1^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Figure 2 (panel top-left) shows the graphical illustration of the problem (34)-(37). The feasible region of the nominal problem is defined by the two gray constraints, while the black lines are contours associated with different values of the objective function. Note that its value is higher inside the unfeasible region. The gray and light gray shadows are indeed 1000 different realizations of the uncertain constraints, and it can be observed that assuming as optimal solution the values given by the nominal parameters (light gray circle $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$), this point is unfeasible for many realizations of the uncertain constraints.

The RC of problem (34)-(37) using [5] formulation is:

$$\underset{x_1;\, x_2}{\text{Maximize}} \quad c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 \ , \tag{38}$$

subject to

$$a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \beta_1 \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{2}\left(\sum_{j=k}^{2} L_{jk}^{(1)} x_j\right)^2} \quad \leq \quad b_1, \tag{39}$$

$$a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \beta_2 \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{2}\left(\sum_{j=k}^{2} L_{jk}^{(2)} x_j\right)^2} \quad \leq \quad b_2, \tag{40}$$

$$x_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\}; \quad i = \ 1, 2, \tag{41}$$

which assuming $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 4.5$, results in the following optimal solution: $\hat{f} = 7$, $\hat{x}_1 = 2$, $\hat{x}_2 = 1$. Once the optimal values of the decision variables are obtained we check the true values of the reliability indexes by solving problem (31). They are equal to $\beta_1^{\text{true}} = 5.71$ and $\beta_2^{\text{true}} = 6.62$ confirming that they are above the minimum required values of 4.5. Note that this is provoked by the integer character of the decision variables because none of the conic constraints are binding at the optimal solution. According to expression (32) the probabilities of infeasibility are $5.7280 \times 10^{-9}$ and $1.7659 \times 10^{-11}$, which are lower than the required probability $\Phi(-\beta_i) = 3.3977 \times 10^{-6}$, i.e. the

| $\nu$ | $\hat{a}_{11}$ | $\hat{a}_{12}$ | $\hat{a}_{21}$ | $\hat{a}_{22}$ | $\hat{x}_1$ | $\hat{x}_2$ | $\|\|\boldsymbol{x}_\nu - \boldsymbol{x}_{\nu-1}\|\|$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1.00000 | 2.00000 | 2.00000 | 1.00000 | 1.00000 | 3.00000 | – |
| 2 | 1.38234 | 2.89652 | 2.17008 | 1.34017 | 2.00000 | 1.00000 | $\sqrt{5}$ |

Table 1: Evolution of the iterative algorithm for the illustrative example.

integer character of the variables involved provides a conservative solution for this particular case.

In contrast, if the iterative method proposed in this paper is used, the convergence to the optimal solution within an pre-specified tolerance to $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$ is achieved in 2 iterations. The evolution of variables for the master and subproblems at every iteration is given in Table 1. Note that the algorithm converges to the same optimal values from problem (38)-(40). The graphical illustration of the iterative process is also shown in Figure 2. For the first iteration we select as initial values of the uncertain parameters their nominal values. The solution of the first master problem corresponds to $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) = (1, 3)$, as shown in Figure 2 (panel top-left). Once the actual values of the decision variables are known, we calculate new approximating hyperplanes of the conic constraints using the analytical solution (22) associated with subproblems (21) for each constraint. This process is shown in Figure 2 panel top-center and panel top-right, respectively. Note that the new estimates are in the circumference of radius $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 4.5$ and their values are given in the second row of Table 1. Using these new approximations, the master problem is solved again. The solution corresponds to $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) = (2, 1)$ and it is shown in Figure 2 (panel bottom-left). Note that the solution is inside the feasible region defined by the approximating hyperplanes and it is also inside the feasible region defined by the nominal values of uncertain parameters. With these new values of the decision variables, we could obtain additional hyperplanes approximating each of the original conic constraints, as shown in Figure 2 (panel bottom-center) and (panel bottom-right). However, it is not required to continue the iterative process because the solution obtained is also feasible in terms of the original conic constraints, which means that the optimal solution of the original problem has been achieved.

Note that in terms of computational time, results achieved using the QCP approach are slightly better. Nevertheless, we implemented all the problems using GAMS [36] and did not make any special efforts to implement the individual steps of our algorithm efficiently, for instance, by taking advantage

that the problems differ slightly on the values of the parameters, specially at the latest iterations. Note also that GAMS takes some time to build the models and this is done at every iteration. Such savings could potentially improve the running time of the algorithm, but not change the number of iterations required. To compare computational performance in a more meaningful way we present the following case study.

## 6. Case study: Optimal Truss Design

This section considers an adapted example about optimal truss design previously used in different works [21, 37, 38], a simple supported truss with 7 elements (bars) as shown in the upper part of Figure 3. Yield stress of all members $\tilde{a}_i; i = 1, \ldots, 7$ are random variables with the following mean and variances: $\mathrm{E}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}] = (-100,\ -100, -200,\ -200, -200, -200, -200)^T; N/mm^2$ and $\mathrm{E}[(\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}} - \mathrm{E}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}])^2] = (15^2,\ 15^2, 40^2,\ 40^2, 40^2, 40^2,\ 40^2)^T; N^2/mm^4$. Note that we use negative values for yield stress because it is more convenient from the formulation perspective. There is a vertical load applied on the structure which is also normally distributed with mean $p = 100kN$ and standard deviation $\sigma_p = 40kN$.

The aim of the design problem is to determine the cross-sectional areas of the bars $x_i; i = 1, \ldots, 7$, so that the probability of failure of each bar due to the uncertainty on yield stress and load is at most 0.001. Instead of working with failure probabilities, and since random parameters are normally distributed, we use relationship (32) to define the protection level of each bar $\beta_i = 3.09; i = 1, \ldots, 7$. In case alternative distributions were used, the bound (9) given by [5] could be used instead. The advantage of this example is that the problem can be easily augmented in size by simply replicating the same block structure as shown in the lower part of Figure 3. Assuming that there are $n_b$ blocks, the robust formulation of the design problem can be written as follows:

$$\underset{x_{ik}; i = 1, \ldots, 7; k = 1, \ldots, n_b}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n_b} \sum_{i=1}^{7} c_i x_{ik} \ , \tag{42}$$

subject to

$$p_k/\tau_i + a_{ik} x_{ik} \leq 0; (a_{ik}, p_k) \in U_{ik}; i = 1, \ldots, 7; , k = 1, \ldots, n_b \tag{43}$$

$$x_{ik} \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, \ldots, 1.8, 1.9, 2\}; i = 1, \ldots, 7; k = 1, \ldots, n_b, \tag{44}$$

where $c_i = 1$ are the cost coefficients, and $\tau_i$ are factors that depend on geometry and the load which are equal to $\tau_i = 1/(2\sqrt{3})$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\tau_i = 1/(\sqrt{3})$ for $i = 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$. The left hand side of constraints (43) correspond to the difference between the actual stresses induced by the vertical load and the actual strength of the bars, note that the negative sign is implicitly included in the yield stress parameter. The optimal solution of one block in terms of decision variables is the same for all blocks, independently of the number of blocks $n_b$ selected, for this reason we can use this example to compare computational performance between the traditional QCP and the proposed decomposition method on problems of different size, and checking afterwards if the optimal solution is attained. Note that that cross sectional areas can only take specific values from a given catalogue, i.e. $x_{ik} \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, \ldots, 1.8, 1.9, 2\}$.

The traditional formulation (13)-(16) proposed by [5] for this example becomes:

$$\underset{x_{ik}; i=1,\ldots,7; k=1,\ldots,n_b}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n_b} \sum_{i=1}^{7} c_i x_{ik} \ , \tag{45}$$

subject to

$$p/\tau_i + a_i x_{ik} + \beta_i \sqrt{(\sigma_p/\tau_i)^2 + \sigma_i^2 x_{ik}^2} \ \leq \ 0; \ i = 1, \ldots, 7; , k = 1, \ldots, n_b \tag{46}$$

$$x_{ik} \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, \ldots, 1.8, 1.9, 2\}; i = 1, \ldots, 7; k = 1, \ldots, n_b, \tag{47}$$

where $p$ is the nominal value of all loads, $a_i; i = 1, \ldots, 7$ and $\sigma_i; i = 1, \ldots, 7$ are, respectively, the nominal and standard deviation of yield stresses associated with bars. Problem (45)-(47) corresponds to a mixed-integer conic quadratic problem.

In contrast, the master and subproblems for problem (45)-(47) are defined as follows:

$$\underset{x_{ik}; i=1,\ldots,7; k=1,\ldots,n_b}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n_b} \sum_{i=1}^{7} c_i x_{ik} \ , \tag{48}$$

subject to

$$\hat{p}_{ik}/\tau_i + \hat{a}_{ik} x_{ik} \leq 0; \ i = 1, \ldots, 7; , k = 1, \ldots, n_b \tag{49}$$

$$x_{ik} \in \{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, \ldots, 1.8, 1.9, 2\}; i = 1, \ldots, 7; k = 1, \ldots, n_b, \tag{50}$$

and

$$\left.\begin{array}{ll} & \underset{\tilde{p}_k,\,\tilde{a}_{ik}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad \tilde{p}_k/\tau_i + \tilde{a}_{ik}x_{ik} \\ \text{subject to} & \\ \left(\dfrac{\tilde{p}_k - p}{\sigma_p}\right)^2 + \left(\dfrac{\tilde{a}_{ik} - a_i}{\sigma_i}\right)^2 \leq & \beta_i^2, \end{array}\right\} i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b. \tag{51}$$

The optimal solution of subproblem (51) according to (22) is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{p}_k \\ \hat{a}_{ik} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ a_i \end{pmatrix} + \beta_i \frac{\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_p^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_i^2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1/\tau_i \\ x_{ik} \end{pmatrix}}{\sqrt{\begin{pmatrix} 1/\tau_i & x_{ik} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_p^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_i^2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1/\tau_i \\ x_{ik} \end{pmatrix}}}; \; \forall ik \tag{52}$$

The optimal solution associated with the RC and MIQCP problem (45)-(47) depends on the number of blocks considered $n_b$ and it is equal to:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \hat{f} = & 7.3n_b \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(k)} = & (0.9,\ 0.9,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1)^T;\ \forall k = 1,\ldots,n_b. \end{array} \tag{53}$$

The corresponding problem has $7 \times n_b$ quadratic constraints, and $7 \times n_b$ integer variables with 15 different possible values and one continuous variable.

We also set out the robust formulation proposed by [7] particularized for this example:

$$\underset{x_{ik};\, i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b}{\text{Minimize}} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n_b}\sum_{i=1}^{7} c_i x_{ik} \ , \tag{54}$$

subject to

$$p_{ik}/\tau_i + a_{ik}x_{ik} + \Gamma_i s_{ik} + \gamma_{ik}^p/\tau_i + \gamma_{ik}^a \leq 0;\ i = 1,\ldots,7;, k = 1,\ldots,n_b \tag{55}$$

$$x_{ik} \in \{0.5, 0.6, \ldots, 1.9, 2\}; i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b,, \tag{56}$$

$$s_{ik} + \gamma_{ik}^p \geq \delta_k^p;\ i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b \tag{57}$$

$$s_{ik} + \gamma_{ik}^a \geq \delta_k^a y_{ik};\ i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b \tag{58}$$

$$-y_{ik} \leq x_{ik} \geq y_{ik};\ i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b \tag{59}$$

$$s_{ik} \geq 0, y_{ik} \geq 0, \gamma_{ik}^p \geq 0, \gamma_{ik}^a \geq 0;\ i = 1,\ldots,7; k = 1,\ldots,n_b, \tag{60}$$

where auxiliary variables $s_{ik}$, $y_{ik}$, $\gamma^p_{ik}$, $\gamma^a_{ik}$ are positive variables required by the formulation, and $\delta^p_k = 100$, $\delta^a_{ik} = 37.5; i = 1, 2$ and $\delta^a_{ik} = 100; i = 3, \ldots, 7$ are the maximum absolute value deviations of the loads and bar strengths from their respective nominal values. In this particular case we have selected those values in such a way that they correspond to 2.5 times the standard deviation related to each random parameter.

The optimal solution associated with the RC problem (54)-(60) depends on the number of blocks considered $n_b$ and it is equal to:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \hat{f} = & 7.5 n_b \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(k)} = & (1,\ 1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1,\ 1.1)^T;\ \forall k = 1, \ldots, n_b. \end{array} \tag{61}$$

The corresponding problem has $35 \times n_b$ linear constraints, $7 \times n_b + 1$ bounded and continuous variables and $28 \times n_b$ positive and continuous variables.

In order to compare the above procedures, the following problems have been solved using different current mathematical modelling solvers and different number of blocks $n_b \in \{10, 100, 1000, 10000\}$:

1. MIQCP problem (45)-(47) with different number of blocks $n_b \in \{10, 100, 1000, 10000\}$, and using BONMIN[39], COUENNE, DICOPT[40] and SBB[40] solvers.
2. MIP$^{(1)}$ problem (48)-(52) and using the decomposition procedure proposed in this paper. Note that the master MIP problems are solved using BONMIN and CPLEX solvers.
3. MIP$^{(2)}$ problem (54)-(60) and using the robust formulation proposed by [7]. Note that the master MIP problems are solved using BONMIN and CPLEX solvers.

All computations have been performed on a desktop PC with four processors clocking at 2.39GHz and 3.25GB of RAM. It is worth mentioning that all results associated with the decomposition procedure (MIP) are obtained after three iterations of the proposed method, using a tolerance of $\epsilon = 10^{-8}$. We imposed a time limit of 9600 seconds so that if the solver does not find an optimal solution within that time the process is stopped.

Table 2 provides the computational times in seconds taken for each solver to reach the optimal solution for the different cases and problems considered. According these results, the following observations are pertinent:

| Problem | Solver | CPU Time (seconds) $n_b = 10$ | $n_b = 10^2$ | $n_b = 10^3$ | $n_b = 10^4$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (45)-(47) MIQCP | BONMIN | 0.141 | 0.953 | 34.703 | 9600* |
| | COUENNE | 0.218 | 1.812 | 80.813 | 9600* |
| | DICOPT | 1.078 | 1318.094§ | 834.562§ | 9600* |
| | SBB | 2.156 | 42.875 | 6161.563 | 9600* |
| (48)-(52) MIP(1) | BONMIN | 0.687 | 0.766 | 7.047 | 1113.922 |
| | CPLEX | 3.125 | 2.937 | 4.282 | 77.906 |
| (54)-(60) MIP(2) | BONMIN | 0.703 | 2.156 | 42.969 | 84.781§ |
| | CPLEX | 0.234 | 0.344 | 4.172 | 363.500 |

(1) $\Longrightarrow$ Proposed iterative method.

(2) $\Longrightarrow$ Bertsimas and Sim (2004) method [7].

$*$ : Maximum time limit reached and no optimal solution found.

§ : No optimal solution found within maximum time limit.

Table 2: Computational results of the case study using different methods, solvers and problem types and sizes.

1. Computational time for MIQCP formulation, analogously to the QCP formulation, increases rapidly with respect to the size of the problem. For 10000 blocks none of the solvers succeed on finding the optimal solution within the maximum time frame of 9600 seconds considered in this work, this result confirms conclusion by [7] that robust optimization using ellipsoidal uncertainty sets is not particularly attractive if integer variables are involved. Note that solver DICOPT is not appropriate even for small size problems because it was no capable of reaching the optimal solution for 100 and 1000 blocks.
2. Computational time for MIP(1) formulation associated with the proposed iterative method allows solving robust optimization problems using ellipsoidal uncertainty sets provided that the appropriate mixed-integer solver, such as CPLEX, is used. Note that computational times are considerably lower than those related to MIQCP formulation.
3. Computational time for MIP(2) formulation associated with the method proposed by [7] is analogous to that obtained for MIP(1) provided that the appropriate mixed-integer solver, such as CPLEX, is used. Note that when the size of the problem grows, MIP(2) formulation seems to be a bit slower than MIP(1), although this result is not statistically

significant. However, we can conclude that both approaches MIP$^{(1)}$ and MIP$^{(2)}$ are alternative formulations to solve robust optimization problems involving mixed-integer variables.

To further reinforce our conclusions, specially the last one in terms of tractability, we run an example using $n_b = 30000$ blocks and solved the robust problems associated with MIP$^{(1)}$ and MIP$^{(2)}$ formulations. Problem MIP$^{(1)}$ at the last iteration has $630,001$ equations, 210001 continuous variables and $210,000$ discrete variables, and it was solved in 1869.609 seconds of CPU time. In contrast, problem MIP$^{(2)}$ has 1050001 equations, 1050001 continuous variables and 210000 discrete variables, and it was solved in 1886.015 seconds of CPU time. Note that both computational times are of the same order of magnitude.

Finally, we run an additional example using $n_b = 10^5$ blocks and solved the robust problems associated with MIP$^{(1)}$ and MIP$^{(2)}$ formulations. Problem MIP$^{(1)}$ at the last iteration has $2,100,001$ equations, $700,001$ continuous variables and 700000 discrete variables, and it was solved in 27675.953 seconds of CPU time. However, problem MIP$^{(2)}$, which has 3500001 equations, 3500001 continuous variables and 700000 discrete variables, could not be solved due to memory problems. CPLEX solver produced an error 1001: Out of memory.

## 7. Conclusions

Based on an outer approximation and decomposition techniques, this paper proposes an iterative method for solving RC of uncertain mixed-integer linear programs with ellipsoidal uncertainty. The method is specially suitable for problems where first and second order moments of the probability distributions of the uncertain parameters involved are available. In addition, the relationship between the decomposable problem and First-Order Second-Moment methods from structural reliability is given.

Additional advantages of the proposed method are:

1. If the uncertain parameters follow a jointly normal distribution, then the exact probability of constraint violation can be calculated though the reliability index.
2. The decoupling between decision variable and uncertainty parameters updating problems allows a richer interpretation of the solution.

3. The decomposition procedure presents good convergence properties and computational behavior, making it suitable to solve large-scale robust linear problems using ellipsoidal uncertainty sets if integer or binary variables are present.
4. The proposed method constitutes a plausible alternative for solving mixed-integer linear robust problems with respect to that proposed by [7]. Both methods present analogous computational time performance, however, the method proposed in this paper presents two additional advantages: i) it requires less memory resources, and ii) allows working with ellipsoidal uncertainty sets.

In summary, the method proposed in this paper allows the applicability of the RC developed by [5] for a wider range of problems, even making it attractive for solving robust discrete optimization models. This decomposition procedure makes RC with ellipsoidal uncertainty to be an alternative method in terms of tractability with respect to the one proposed by [7], which uses cardinality constrained uncertainty sets.

Further research includes the extension of the proposed decomposition technique to linear programming formulations, and its comparison in terms of performance with respect to interior-point algorithms.

## Acknowledgments

Dr. Casero-Alonso has been sponsored by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and grant contract FEDER MTM2013-47879-C2-1-P.

## References

[1] A. L. Soyster, Convex programming with set-inclusive constraints and applications to inexact linear programming, Oper. Res. 21 (5) (1973) 1154–1157. doi:10.1287/opre.21.5.1154.

[2] L. El-Ghaoui, H. Lebret, Robust solutions to least-squares problems with uncertain data, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl. 18 (4) (1997) 1035–1064. doi:10.1137/S0895479896298130.

[3] L. El-Ghaoui, F. Oustry, H. Lebret, Robust solutions to uncertain semidefinite programs, SIAM J. on Optimization 9 (1) (1998) 33–52. doi:10.1137/S1052623496305717.

[4] A. Ben-Tal, A. Nemirovski, Robust convex optimization, Mathematics of Operations Research 23 (4) (1998) 769–805. doi:10.1287/moor.23.4.769.

[5] A. Ben-Tal, A. Nemirovski, Robust solutions of uncertain linear programs, Operations Research Letters 25 (1) (1999) 1 – 13. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6377(99)00016-4.

[6] A. Ben-Tal, A. Nemirovski, Robust solutions of linear programming problems contaminated with uncertain data, Mathematical Programming 88 (3) (2000) 411–424. doi:10.1007/PL00011380.

[7] D. Bertsimas, M. Sim, The price of robustness, Oper. Res. 52 (1) (2004) 35–53. doi:10.1287/opre.1030.0065.

[8] J. R. Birge, F. Louveaux, Introduction to Stochastic Programming, Springer Verlag, New York, 1997.

[9] R. T. Rockafellar, S. Uryasev, Optimization of conditional value-at risk, J. Risk 2 (3) (2000) 21–41.

[10] R. T. Rockafellar, S. Uryasev, Conditional value-at risk for general loss distributions, J. Bank. Finan. 26 (7) (2002) 1443–1471.

[11] V. Gabrel, C. Murat, A. Thiele, Recent advances in robust optimization: An overview, European Journal of Operational Research 235 (2014) 471–483.

[12] M. Housh, A. Ostfeld, U. Shamir, Optimal multiyear management of a water supply system under uncertainty: Robust counterpart approach, Water Resources Research 47 (10) (2011) n/a–n/a. doi:10.1029/2011WR010596.

[13] L. Perelman, M. Housh, A. Ostfeld, Robust optimization for water distribution systems least cost design, Water Resources Research 49 (10) (2013) 6795–6809. doi:10.1002/wrcr.20539.

[14] D. M. Frangopol, Reliability-based optimum structural design, in: C. Sundarajan (Ed.), Probabilistic Structural Mechanics Handbook, Chapmam & Hall, New York, 1995, Ch. 16, pp. 352–387.

[15] R. E. Melchers, Structural reliability analysis and prediction, 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1999.

[16] J. O. Royset, A. Der Kiureghian, E. Polak, Reliability-based optimal design of series structural systems, Journal of Engineering Mechanics, ASCE 127 (6) (2001) 607–614.

[17] J. O. Royset, A. Der Kiureghian, E. Polak, Reliability-based optimal structural design by the decoupling approach, Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf. 73 (3) (2001) 213–221.

[18] J. O. Royset, A. Der Kiureghian, E. Polak, Optimal design with probabilistic objective and constraints, Journal of Engineering Mechanics, ASCE 132 (1) (2006) 107–118.

[19] A. M. Hasofer, N. C. Lind, Exact and invariant second moment code format, J. Engrg. Mech. 100 (EM1) (1974) 111–121.

[20] R. Mínguez, A. J. Conejo, R. García-Bertrand, Reliability and decomposition techniques to solve certain class of stochastic programming problems, Reliability Engineering & System Safety 96 (2011) 314–323. doi:10.1016/j.rees.2010.09.011.

[21] R. T. Rockafellar, J. O. Royset, On buffered failure probability in design and optimization of structures, Reliability Engineering & System Safety 95 (2010) 499–510.

[22] R. Fletcher, S. Leyffer, Solving mixed integer nonlinear programs by outer approximation, Mathematical Programming 66 (3) (1994) 327–349.

[23] C. A. Floudas, Nonlinear and Mixed-Integer Optimization. Fundamentals and Applications, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.

[24] A. J. Conejo, E. Castillo, R. Mínguez, R. García-Bertrand, Decomposition techniques in mathematical programming. Engineering and science applications, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, New York, 2006.

[25] A. Ben-Tal, L. El Ghaoui, A. Nemirovski, Robust Optimization, Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2009.

[26] E. Delage, Y. Ye, Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems, Operations Research 58 (3) (2010) 595–612.

[27] D. Bertsimas, D. B. Brown, C. Caramanis, Theory and applications of robust optimization, SIAM Review 53 (3) (2011) 464–501.

[28] M. Pinar, A simple duality proof in convex quadratic programming with a quadratic constraint, and some applications, European Journal of Operational Research 124 (1) (2000) 151–158. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(99)00173-3.

[29] M. Duran, I. E. Grossmann, An outer-approximation algorithm for a class of mixed integer nonlinear programs, Mathematical Programming 36 (1986) 307–339.

[30] A. M. Freudenthal, Safety and the probability of structural failure, Transactions, ASCE 121 (1956) 1337–1397.

[31] R. Rackwitz, B. Fiessler, Structural reliability under combined load sequences, Comput. Struct. 9 (1978) 489–494.

[32] O. Ditlevsen, Principle of normal tail approximation, J. Engineering Mechanics Div., ASCE 107 (6) (1981) 1191–1208.

[33] M. Hohenbichler, R. Rackwitz, Non-normal dependent vectors in structural safety, J. Engineering Mechanics Div., ASCE 107 (6) (1981) 1227–1238.

[34] R. Mínguez, M. Castillo, Reliability-based optimization in engineering using decomposition techniques and FORMS, Structural Safety 31 (3) (2009) 214–223.

[35] E. Castillo, A. J. Conejo, R. Mínguez, C. Castillo, A closed formula for local sensitivity analysis in mathematical programming, Engineering Optimization 38 (1) (2006) 93–112.

[36] A. Brooke, D. Kendrick, A. Meeraus, R. Raman, GAMS: A user's guide, GAMS Development Corporation, Washington, 1998.

[37] R. Mínguez, F. F. Jaime, A. Tomás, J. L. Lara, Iterative scenario reduction technique to solve reliability-based optimization problems using the buffered failure probability, in: Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Structural Safety & Reliability (ICOSSAR 2013), New York, NY, 2013.

[38] R. Mínguez, F. F. Jaime, A. Tomás, E. Castillo, New insights on the buffered failure probability risk measure for optimal structural design, in: Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Structural Safety & Reliability (ICOSSAR 2013), New York, NY, 2013.

[39] P. Bonami, L. Biegler, A. Conn, G. Cornuejols, I. Grossmann, C. Laird, J. Lee, A. Lodi, F. Margot, N. Sawaya, A. Waechter, An algorithmic framework for convex mixed integer nonlinear programs, Discrete Optimization 5 (2) (2008) 186–204.

[40] R. E. Rosenthal, GAMS: A user's guide, GAMS Development Corporation, Washington, 2008.




a) Initial random space ($\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}$)




b) Transformed random space ($\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}$)

Figure 1: Joint probability distribution function contours, limit-state equation, and design points in: a) the initial random space $\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}^{(i)}$, and b) the unit standard normal random space $\boldsymbol{z}^{(i)}$.




Figure 2: Graphical illustration of the master and subproblem solutions associated with the iterative solution for the illustrative example.: panels on the left side correspond to master problem solutions, panels on the middle are related to subproblems for the first constraint and panels on the right side correspond to subproblems for the second constraint.




Figure 3: Truss design example.